IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA ROANOKE DIVISION

BLERK'S EXPICE U.S. DIST COURT AT ROANOKE, VA FILED		
JUN 13 2005		
HOHIN F CORCORAN, CLERK By		
DEPUTY CLERK		

BRAULIO PEREZ-TORRES,)	DEPUT
#14184-265,)	Civil Action No. 7:05-CV-003105
Petitioner,)	Criminal Action No. 6:01-CR-30038
)	
v.)	MEMORANDUM OPINION
UNITED STATES, Respondent.)	
)	By: Hon. Norman K. Moon
)	United States District Judge

Petitioner Braulio Perez-Torres, a Federal inmate proceeding <u>pro se</u>, brings this action to Vacate, Set Aside, or Correct Sentence, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255. In his petition, Perez-Torres requests re-sentencing on his 2002 federal conviction as a result of the Supreme Court's opinions in <u>Blakely v. Washington</u>, 124 S. Ct. 2531, 159 L. Ed. 2d 403 (2004) and <u>United States v. Booker</u>, 125 S. Ct. 738 (Jan. 12, 2005) and ineffective assistance of counsel. However, because Perez-Torres's conviction became final almost three years ago, his motion must be dismissed.

The Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (AEDPA) amended 28 U.S.C. § 2255 to include a one-year limitation period. Normally, the limitation period runs from the date on which the conviction became final. See 28 U.S.C. § 2255 ¶ 6(1). The court sentenced Perez-Torres on June 12, 2002. Perez-Torres's conviction became final ten days after judgment was entered, when Perez-Torres failed to appeal his conviction and sentence to the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. See Fed. R. App. Pro. 4(b)(1)(A). Therefore, the limitation period on Perez-Torres's claims expired almost two years ago.

It appears that Perez-Torres is attempting to claim that <u>Blakely</u> and <u>Booker</u> are new rules, which are retroactive to cases on collateral review and that as such they restart the limitation period pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 ¶ 6(3). However, the court finds that <u>Blakely</u> and <u>Booker</u> do not apply

retroactively to Perez-Torres's case. <u>See Lilly v. United States</u>, 342 F. Supp. 2d 532 (W.D.Va. 2004).

Because Perez-Torres's petition is untimely, the court must file and dismiss his petition. In addition, even if his claims were timely, the rule in <u>Blakely</u> and <u>Booker</u> do not apply retroactively to Perez-Torres's case. An appropriate order will be entered this day.

ENTER: This $\frac{13^{11}}{2}$ day of June, 2005

UNITED STATES DISTRICT HIDGE